



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/583,703	05/31/2000	Oleg B. Rashkovskiy	INTL-0409-US (P8992)	5209	
7590 12/02/2005			EXAM	EXAMINER	
Timothy N Tro	op		LUU, LE	HIEN	
Trop Pruner & Hu PC 8554 Katy Freeway			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Ste 100	way .		2141		
Houston, TX 77024			DATE MAILED: 12/02/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		09/583,703	RASHKOVSKIY, OLEG B.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Le H. Luu	2141	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication a	1.	1	
A SH THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a red operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	<ol> <li>In no event, however, may a reply be tined.</li> <li>In no event, however, may a reply be tined.</li> <li>In no event, however, may a reply be tined.</li> <li>In no event, may be the perfect of the property of the perfect of the perfect</li></ol>	nely filed  s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>15</u> This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) The Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	nis action is non-final.  vance except for formal matters, pro		
Dispositi	ion of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-3,5-13 and 15-29</u> is/are pending i 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdred Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) <u>1-3,5-13 and 15-29</u> is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.		
Applicati	ion Papers			
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examile The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) and a specificant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct the oath or declaration is objected to by the left.	ccepted or b) objected to by the later drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Secution is required if the drawing(s) is objection	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119		·	
12)□ a)[	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents.  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Buresee the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received.  nts have been received in Applicati  iority documents have been receive  au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on Noed in this National Stage	
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔲 Inforr	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0	·/		
Pape	r No(s)/Mail Date	6)  Other:		

1. Claims 1-3, 5-13, and 15-29 are presented for examination.

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-3, 5-13, and 15-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Compton et al. (Compton) patent no. 6,115,035, in view of Hatori patent no. 5,778,382, and Wesinger, Jr. et al. (Wesinger) patent no. 5,778,367.
- 4. As to claim 1, Compton teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including a method comprising:

automatically searching for streaming video files on a plurality of web sites (col. 2 lines 11-25; col. 3 lines 33-46; col. 4 lines 30-42; col. 5 lines 5-28; search engine inherently searches plurality of web sites);

selecting particular streaming video files from said plurality of web sites based on a text search using keywords (Compton, col. 3 lines 33-46; col. 4 lines 30-42; col. 5 lines 5-27; search engine inherently use text search using keywords search on plurality of web sites. Inherent teaching can be found in Wesinger, Jr. et al. patent no.

5,778,367; Wesinger, col. 2 lines 8-16; col. 9 lines 55-65); and

in response to said search, automatically generating representations of said streaming video files for display as a graphical user interface based streaming video programming guide (Compton, col. 4 lines 43-65; col. 7 line 16-27).

However, Compton does not explicitly teach organizing said streaming video files representations by said keywords for display.

Hatori teaches using keyword to denote a retrieval-result display area for displaying items of data retrieved with searched keyword (Hatori, figure 9; Abstract, col. 4 lines 30-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Compton and Hatori to organize said streaming video files representations by said keywords for display because it would allow items of data with the keyword are displayed at a predetermined area on a display screen.

- 5. As to claim 2, Compton teaches automatically searching for streaming video files includes automatically searching for predetermined file extensions associated with streaming video files (col. 4 lines 43-65, fig 3).
- 6. As to claim 3, Compton teaches automatically searching for streaming video files includes automatically searching for streaming video file extensions and for keywords in web sites associated with said streaming video files (Compton, col. 4 lines 30-42).

Page 4

Art Unit: 2141

- 7. As to claims 5-7, Compton and Hatori teach displaying a graphical user interface containing representations of a plurality of keyword-defined categories and video files associated with said categories, representing each video file by a thumbnail frame, and playing said video file in response to a user selection of said thumbnail video (Compton, col. 4 lines 43-65; col. 7 line 16-27; Hatori, figure 9; Abstract, col. 4 lines 30-48).
- 8. As to claims 8-10, Compton and Hatori teach using said keywords as category icons and displaying a plurality of video files associated with each category icon, accessing said video file over the Internet in response to a user selection of said video file, and periodically automatically searching for streaming video files (Reilly, figure 10, col. 13 line 28 col. 14 line 16).
- 9. As to claim 24, Compton and Reilly teach automatically searching the Internet includes automatically transmitting a request to a remote web server for a search engine to perform said Internet search (Compton, col. 4 lines 30-65; col. 7 line 16-27; Hatori, figure 9; Abstract, col. 4 lines 30-48).
- 10. Claims 11-13, 15-23, and 25-29 have similar limitations as claims 1-3, 5-10 and 24; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.
- 11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 5-13, and 15-29 have been

Art Unit: 2141

considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See M.P.E.P. § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Le H. Luu whose telephone number is 571-272-3884. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 09/583,703

Art Unit: 2141

Page 6

LE HIEN LUU PRIMARY EXAMINER